## **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT** SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

NOTICE OF DOCUMENT DISCREPANCIES

2008 APR 23 Pi 2: 45

				Tran M	This space for	
	\			CLERK US DESTRICT CONTROL SOUTHERN DISTRICT	l W = Clerk's Office i the slump	
TO	: XIII S DISTRIC	CT JUDGE / 🖵 U. S. MA			DEPUTY	
FR	OM: J. Paris,	Deputy Clerk	RI	EGEIVED DATE:	4/18/08	
CASE NO.: 08cr840 DOCUMENT FILED BY: Steven Stephenson						
CASE TITLE: USA v. Stephenson						
DOCUMENT ENTITLED: Motion for Substitution of Attorney						
Upon the submission of the attached document(s), the following discrepancies are noted:						
1	Local Rule	Discrepancy				
X	5.1 Missing time and date on motion and/or supporting documentation					
	5.3 Document illegible or submitted on thermal facsimile paper					
$\bar{\Box}$	5.4 Document not filed electronically. Notice of Noncompliance already issued.					
$\bar{\Box}$	7.1 or 47.1 Date noticed for hearing not in compliance with rules/Document(s) are not timely					
	7.1 or 47.1 Lacking memorandum of points and authorities in support as a separate documer					
$\bar{\Box}$	7.1 or 47.1 Briefs or memoranda exceed length restrictions					
$\bar{\Box}$	7.1 Missing table of contents					
	15.1 Amended pleading not complete in itself					
	30.1	Depositions not accepted absent a court order				
		Supplemental documents require court order				
$\bar{\Box}$		Default Judgment in sum certain includes calculated interest				
	OTHER:					
				Date forwarded	4/22/08	
ORDER OF THE JUDGE / MAGISTRATE JUDGE						
IT I ¬	IT IS HEREBY ORDERED:					
	_	be filed nunc pro tunc to				
4	The document is NOT to be filed, but instead REJECTED. and it is ORDERED that the Clerk serve a copy of this order on all parties. Defendent's lowest only.					
	Rejected documen	Rejected document to be returned to pro se or inmate? Yes. Court Copy retained by chambers				
	Counsel is advised that any further failure to comply with the Local Rules may lead to penalties pursuant to Local Rule 83.1  CHAMBERS OF:					
	Dated: 4.23	-88	Ву:	DANA M.	SABRAW	

HE! STEPHEN 2:08-41-00840-DMS/ Document 26 Filed 04/23/2008 Page 2 of 3 PAG. # 07486-298 1K" onic. C. 808 Union st. REJECTED SAN DIEGO CA 92101 LINITED STRUES DISTRUT COURT PRO-PER SOLTHERN BISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA C Me affords CRIMINA/ CASE No . CROO 840DMS-1 LINAED STATES of AMERICA, MOTION FOR SUBSTITUTION OF COUNSE! UNDER SIXTH AMENYMENT Stephen Stephenson, Defendant. Pursuant, STRICHLAND V. WAShington EMERGENCY MOTION (HONOLABLE JUDGE DANN M. SABRIW) DEFENDANT, STEPHEN STEPHENSON PETITIONS THIS COURT, Klongrable Tudge Dana M. Sabraw for Granting of Substitution of parsent counsel: ATTY, Mahir T. Sherif, Lased on lack of Communication, and lies, and DIFFERANCE of Opinion; pursuant; To Strickland V. Washington, 466 U.S. 668, 801 Ed 2d 614 104 5 CT. 2051 674, 104 J.CT. 2052. The performance of defense ecourse is a executivempenent of the system of protection empodied in the Sixth Amendment.

Defendant unses this court to count this request, and GAAAF Defendant to Rephesont himself; PRO-peA. in furtherance of Justice. Executed April 14, 2008. Prespectfully Sumitted, DATE, COURT 6-27/08 STEPHEN STEPHENSON